

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/811,441	03/26/2004	Scott Michael Davis	147161-2	1481	
25	7590 08/21/2007 BUDN LLP		EXAM	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH			MORILLO, JANELL COMBS		
BLOOMFIELD	D, CT 06002		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1742		
			<u></u>		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/21/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/811,441	DAVIS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Janelle Combs-Morillo	1742			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period verallure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nety filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 Ju	<u>ıne 2007</u> .				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims		•			
4)  Claim(s) 1-23 and 28-30 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are withe 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-21 and 28-30 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	drawn from consideration.				
Application Papers  9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	•	•			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	* * * *	, ,			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
Notice of Preferences Cited (F10-092)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Dateb/4/07	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te			

## DETAILED ACTION

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art arc such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 7, 10-14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2840246A1 (FR'246).

FR'246 teaches a process for forming an article by a) heating a resinous substrate, b) contacting with shaped surface of a mold, c) thermoforming to bond said components at typically  $0.1 \times 10^5$ - $1 \times 10^6$  Pa (10-1000 kPa), d) cooling between molds and demolding (abstract, p 6), substantially as claimed in instant claims 1, 7, 10-12. Concerning claims 13 and 14, FR'246 teaches thermoforming is achieved by a reduction of air pressure in the mold (abstract) and therefore 'air' meets 'a conformable pressure-transmitting medium'. Though FR'246 does not specify that the resinous substrate (to be heated in step a) is reinforced, FR'246 teaches reinforcement is applied to the thermoplastic resinous substrate (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add reinforcement to the resinous substrate prior to initially thermoforming, because FR'246 teaches said reinforcement is capable of being thermoformed (abstract).

Concerning claim 16, FR'246 teaches said resinous substrate can be a variety of polymer compositions, including polycarbonates (p 3).

Application/Control Number: 10/811,441

Art Unit: 1742

3. Claims 2-6, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2840246A1 (FR'246) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Mitten et al (US 2002/0182352A1).

FR'246 does not mention the use of tie layers (cl.2, 4, 6), additional film layers, compatible, or balance layers (cl. 3, 5, 15). However, Mitten teaches that it is well known in the art to form multilayer shaped laminates by thermoforming laminate films with two or more layers and at least one bond-promoting tie layers, selected because said tie layers improve adhesion (p 7, [0040], [0045], [0062], [0063], [0035], abstract). Mitten further teaches thermoforming said layers (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form additional film layers & tie layers, as taught by Mitten, for the thermoforming process taught by FR'246, because Mitten teaches said layers are selected to improve adhesion and bonding with a superior and economical formed product (abstract).

4. Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 15-21, 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 2840246A1 (FR'246) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Reafler et al (US 5,026,448).

FR'246 does not mention the use of tie layers (cl.2, 4, 6), additional film layers, compatible, or balance layers (cl. 3, 5, 15). However, Reafler teaches that it is well known in the art to form multilayer shaped laminates by thermoforming laminate films with two or more layers and at least one bond-promoting tie layers, selected because said tie layers improve adhesion (column 3 lines 42-45). Reafler further teaches thermoforming said layers (column 4 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form additional film layers & tie layers, as taught by Reafler, for the thermoforming process taught by FR'246,

Application/Control Number: 10/811,441

Art Unit: 1742

because Reafler teaches said layers are selected to improve adhesion and bonding (abstract).

Concerning claim 15, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a layer to the substrate opposite the side of the film layer, in order to form a protective surface on said substrate (Reafler, abstract).

FR'246 does not mention forming the shaped surface component by thermoforming said shape in a mold, followed by thermoforming/bonding it together with the heated substrate (cl. 7-9).

Concerning claims 8 and 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to thermoform a preformed layer with either a) not removing from the mold or b) placing in 2<sup>nd</sup> thermoforming mold, and further thermoforming these compatible layers, because Reafler teaches sequentially thermoforming improves the desirable surface qualities when such materials are stretched by thermoforming and bonded to a substrate (column 2 lines 30-32), and depending on the intended thermoformed profile/ application (i.e. for an identical profile it would have been obvious to not remove from thermoforming apparatus in view of optimizing efficiency).

Concerning claims 20 and 21, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to thermoform a preformed layer and separately thermoforming the compatible substrate layer, and further thermoforming or adhesively bonding together (with a tie layer, etc), because Reafler teaches sequentially thermoforming in separate steps improves the desirable surface qualities when such materials are stretched by thermoforming and bonded to a substrate (column 2 lines 30-32).

Concerning claims 16-19, 28-30, FR'246 does not mention the surface component comprises an arylate polyester (cl. 16-19, 28, 29) or the polymers mentioned in claim 30, or

Application/Control Number: 10/811,441 Page 5

Art Unit: 1742

including a compatible layer w additive for aesthetic effect (cl. 18). However, Reafler teaches a paint coated basecoat sheet (which qualifies as a compatible layer with an additive for aesthetic effect) bonded to a carrier film and bonded to a substrate by thermoforming (see Fig. 3a), with further clearcoat sheet and optional tie layers to improve boding of the paint layer to the carrier film (column 3 lines 42-44). Reafler teaches the clearcoat sheet (includes surface component) can be made from polycarbonates, polyacrylates, polyurethanes, polyethylene terephthalate (column 4 lines 42-43, 57-58), which meets the composition in instant claims 28-30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the composition of surface component and added tie layers and compatible layers taught by Reafler for the method of thermoforming taught by FR'246 because Reafler teaches said polymers form films that will stretch when heated in thermoforming process and provide a smooth, glossy topcoat (column 4 lines 50-52), and

## Response to Arguments

because Reafler teaches said tie layer improves bonding (column 3 lines 42-45).

- 5. In the response filed on June 4, 2007 applicant added new claims 28-30. The examiner agrees that no new matter has been added.
- 6. The rejection in view of Dunton under 103(c) has been overcome. However, the instant claims are newly rejected in view of FR'246, etc., substantially as set forth above.

Application/Control Number: 10/811,441

Art Unit: 1742

## Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janelle Combs-Morillo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1240. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am- 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JCM August 2, 2007

HOY KING SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER SUPERVISORY OZNIEN 1700